

5-11-1977

CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 05/11/1977

Esther Peterson

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fsminutes>

Recommended Citation

Peterson, Esther, "CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 05/11/1977" (1977). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 810.
<http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fsminutes/810>

This Meeting Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the CWU Faculty Senate Archive at ScholarWorks@CWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@CWU. For more information, please contact pingfu@cwu.edu.

MINUTES: Regular Senate Meeting, 11 May 1977
Presiding Officer: Helmi Habib, Chairman
Recording Secretary: Esther Peterson

The meeting was called to order at 3:15 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Senators Present: All Senators or their alternates were present except Pearl Douce', Charles Hawkins, and Kris Graap.

Visitors Present: James Brennan, Ham Howard, Jim Alexander, Jay Bachrach, Lou Bovos, Rae Heimbeck, Kent Richards, Otto Jakubek, Daniel Ramsdell, Quentin Fitzgerald, Don Schliesman, and Don Caughey.

AGENDA CHANGES AND APPROVAL

The chairman suggested the following changes:

1. Under "Communications" add
 - A. Letter from Usha Mahajandi
 - B. Letter from Russell Hansen
 - C. Memo from Quentin Fitzgerald
 - D. Letter from John Ressler
2. Under "New Business" add
 - A. Consideration of proposed Honors College
 - B. Consideration of Salary Scale Proposal
3. Delete "Approval of Minutes of May 4"

Chairman Habib announced there will be another Senate Meeting next Wednesday, May 18.

COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were received:

- A. Letter from Usha Mahajani, thanking the Senate for the get-well card she received, and saying she will be joining Central again in the Fall of 1977.
- B. Letter from Russell Hansen, chairman of the department of Sociology, dated May 5, requesting the Senate to withdraw from the Agenda Soc. 234, Mexican Villages, which was recently approved by the U.C.C.. He has just learned that the CWSC Program in Mexico is being cancelled, and there is no longer a reason to add the course to the CWSC catalogue.
- C. Memorandum from Quentin Fitzgerald, Chairman of the Graduate Council, dated May 4, requesting the Senate reconsider recommendations concerning the graduate program of re-organizing from its present membership to a ten member Council. He lists several comments concerning the reduction in size of this council.
- D. Letter from John Ressler, Chairman of Geography, dated May 11, 1977, in which he lists several reasons he is in opposition of the General Ed Proposal, and is requesting the Senate reject the proposal.

CURRICULUM PROPOSALS

- A. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee proposals, page 467.

MOTION NO. 1609: Mr. Street moved, seconded by Mr. Gulezian, to approve the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee proposals on page 467. Passed by a unanimous voice vote.

REPORTS

- A. Chairman's Report--Mr. Habib reported that there are three departments that need solicitation members for the C.I.F. The Executive Committee is attempting to identify solicitors or do the job themselves for these departments. Mr. Habib requested that payroll deduction cards should be returned to departmental solicitors, who should then send them on to the Senate Office. He informed the Senate that this is to be a yearly project; however, if the Faculty doesn't participate this year, businessmen won't participate after this year.

Several handouts were distributed to the Senators at the meeting, as follows:

- 1) an addendum to the Campus Committee Structure Proposal that was distributed at the last Senate meeting;
- 2) Budget Committee Report, which includes a narrative and a salary scale;
- 3) Honors College Proposal;
- 4) Mechanism for nomination of officers next year along with a Senate roster. Several changes in Senators which do not appear on the roster are Mr. Bachrach replaces John Utzinger, Mr. Rolin replaces Mr. McQuarrie after May 20, Stan Dudley has now replaced Robert Envick in Technology and Industrial Ed.
- 5) Report from the Senate Curriculum Committee to be discussed later in the meeting.

Mr. Habib asked Mr. Brooks to give a brief resume of what is going on in Olympia. Mr. Brooks said that, regarding the C.I.F., he has been advised by some of the businessmen in town that the participation rate is 80% among the businessmen on first contact. Mr. Brooks reported on the budget situation in the legislature.

- B. Executive Committee report--This was covered by Dr. Habib in his report.

C. Standing Committees--

1. Academic Affairs Committee--Mr. McQuarrie presented the Honors College proposal. Copies of the proposal were distributed at this meeting.

MOTION NO. 1610: Mr. McQuarrie moved for the adoption of the Senate Academic Affairs Committee's report recommending approval of the Honors College Proposal.

Mr. McQuarrie explained the proposal to the Senate, and suggested it be postponed until after the Senate has a chance to review it.

MOTION NO. 1611: Mr. McQuarrie moved, seconded by Mr. Keith, to postpone consideration of the Honors College Proposal until the next Senate meeting, May 18. Passed with a unanimous voice vote.

2. Budget Committee--Mr. Warren presented the Recommendations of the Senate Budget Committee for a New Salary Scale and Disposition of Possible Salary Increases.

MOTION NO. 1612: Mr. Warren moved, seconded by Mr. McClure, that consideration of the recommendation of the Budget Committee be postponed until the next Senate meeting on May 18. Passed by a unanimous voice vote.

3. Code Committee--No report.

4. Curriculum Committee--Mr. Street presented a brief report, as follows:

- (1) The Curriculum Committee has completed its updating of the Curriculum Guide. Revisions have been made on 16 pages of the guide and have been submitted to the Executive Committee of the Senate. The changes consist of (a) correcting omissions (b) implementing Senate actions, (c) reflecting changes in college administrative procedures, and (d) providing clarity and internal consistency.
- (2) The Curriculum Committee is in receipt of letters from Professors Teets, Habib, and Richards, all relating to proposals submitted to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee to change 21 History courses to variable credit format. The Senate considered the question of variable credit courses at some length in the fall of 1976. A chronology of those events is attached to this report.

C. Consideration and Action on Proposed General Education Program.

Mr. Habib reminded the Senate that there is a motion on the floor, Motion No. 1607, which was to accept the recommendations of the Academic Affairs and Curriculum Committee, jointly, on the General Education Program, with some modifications.

MOTION NO. 1620: Mr. Utzinger moved, seconded by Ms. Lester, to postpone any action on this report until May 25.

Mr. Utzinger explained the main reason that he would like to see it postponed is that the Academic Affairs and Curriculum Committees have made several important changes in the proposal made by the General Studies Committee and it is not to the best interest of the College to approve it without conferring with the Committee. It would therefore be hoped that in the next two weeks the two committees would have a chance to confer.

Mr. Vifian pointed out that the Senate Committees have already met with the General Studies Committee.

Motion No. 1620 to postpone was voted on and failed by a majority voice vote.

MOTION NO. 1621: Ms. Hileman moved to divide the motion in two parts. Died for lack of a second.

MOTION NO. 1622: Mr. Warren moved to amend, seconded by Mr. Street, that the Basic Studies P.E. 2 credit requirement be removed.

Discussion began on the amendment.

MOTION NO. 1623: Mr. Keith moved for the previous question, to stop debate on the amendment. Passed by a hand vote of 25 Yes, 4 No, and no abstentions.

Motion No. 1622 to amend voted on by roll call:

Aye: Corwin King, Gordon Warren, and Warren Street.

Nay: Duncan McQuarrie, Curt Wiberg, Owen Dugmore, Dolores Osborn, George Fadenrecht, Rosella Dickson, Ken Winslow, John Utzinger, Chuck McClure, Robert Yee, Nancy Lester, Stan Dudley, John Gregor, Robert Mitchell, Russell Ross, Neil Roberts, Joel Andress, Frank Carlson, Charles Hawkins, Milo Smith, Betty Hileman, Dale Samuelson, and Art Keith.

Abstain: Allen Gulezian, Kathleen Adams, John Vifian, and Larry Porter.

The amendment failed by 3 Aye, 23 Nay, 4 Abstentions.

MOTION NO. 1624: Mr. King moved, seconded by Mr. Utzinger, to postpone consideration of the main motion until next week, May 18. Passed with a unanimous voice vote.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

All of the possible uses of the variable credit policy alluded to in Professor Teets's letter were discussed then. The vote of the Senate reflected the sentiment that the versatility of the variable credit format was more important than any abuses that may result, since the probability of abuses was judged to be low. As Professor Richards's letter points out, the vote was quite clear on this point and there is no policy reason why the variable credit proposal of the History department should not be approved.

- (3) The Executive Committee of the Graduate Council has asked for comment on the appropriateness of assigning a graduate course number to the proposed addition to the Mathematics curriculum titled Fun With Numbers. The course is designed to teach school teachers about some of the intriguing properties of mathematical processes, mathematical games, etc. While the curriculum guide has no guidelines regarding graduate level courses, it is clear from the guide that the assignment of a course to its appropriate level is determined by the nature of the course content, not the class standing of students most likely to take the course. Since the mathematical complexity of this course is admittedly low, an undergraduate number would seem most appropriate.

MOTION NO. 1613: Mr. Street moved, seconded by Ms. Lester, that the report of the Curriculum Committee be received by the Senate. Passed with a unanimous voice vote.

5. Personnel Committee--no report.

6. Student Affairs Committee--no report

OLD BUSINESS

A. Consideration and Action on Code Changes Parts III and IV.

Mr. Habib pointed out that Part III has already been approved by the Senate.

MOTION NO. 1614: Mr. McClure moved, seconded by Mr. Dudley, to approve the Code Committee recommendations, Part IV. Passed by a unanimous voice vote.

B. Consideration and Action on Proposed Campus Committee Structure.

Mr. Habib explained that the Addendum distributed to the Senators at this meeting contained several changes.

MOTION NO. 1615: Mr. Keith moved, seconded by Ms. Lester, for the adoption of the proposed changes in Campus Committees, along with the Addendum which was distributed, entitled Campus Committee Structure.

Discussion began on the motion. Mr. Quentin Fitzgerald discussed Graduate Council objections to the changes.

MOTION NO. 1616: Mr. Street moved to amend, seconded by Mr. Yee, that Council membership be limited to three year terms with the proviso that members are not to be allowed to serve consecutive terms.

MOTION NO. 1617: Mr. McQuarrie moved, seconded by Mr. Keith, to amend the amendment by changing the number of terms to two and that the initial committee assignments be staggered 1/3 for one year, 1/3 for two years, and 1/3 for three years. Passed with a majority voice vote.

Motion No. 1616, as amended, passed with a unanimous voice vote.

MOTION NO. 1618: Mr. Street moved, seconded by Mr. Hawkins, to amend Part 1 by striking the words "that have graduate programs" and replace with the words "that are directly involved in graduate education." Passed with a unanimous voice vote.

MOTION NO. 1619: Mr. McQuarrie moved, seconded by Mr. Hawkins, to postpone consideration of this item until next week, and in the meantime obtain a copy of Mr. Fitzgerald's letter regarding his concern. Failed by a majority nay vote.

Motion No. 1615 voted on and passed with a majority voice vote.

Feb. 1977

FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF

May 11

ROLL CALL

SENATOR

ALTERNATE

✓ Adams, Kathleen

✓ Address, Joel

✓ Brooks, James

✓ Carlson, Frank

✓ Dickson, Rosella

~~Dietz, Richard~~

Douce', Pearl

✓ Dugmore, Owen

✓ ~~Dudley, Stan~~

✓ Envick, Robert

✓ Fadenrecht, George

✓ Franz, Wolfgang

✓ Gulezian, Allen

✓ Gregor, John

~~Guap, Chris~~

✓ Habib, Helmi

✓ Hawkins, Charles

✓ Hilcman, Betty

✓ Jensen, Richard

✓ King, Corwin

✓ Keith, Art

✓ Lester, Nancy

~~Mahajani, Usha~~

✓ McClure, Chuck

✓ McQuarrie, Duncan

✓ Mitchell, Robert

✓ Osborn, Dolores

✓ Porter, Larry

✓ Ross, Russell

✓ Sahlstrand, Margaret

✓ Samuelson, Dale

✓ Smith, Milo

✓ Street, Warren

✓ Utzinger, John

✓ Vifian, John

✓ Warren, Gordon

✓ Wiberg, Curt

✓ Winslow, Ken

✓ Young, Madge

~~Yee, Robert~~

Clayton Denman

Cal Willberg

Ed Harrington

Glenn Madsen

Imani Mwandishi

Woodrow Monte

Robert Nuzum

Ron Hales

William Schmidt

✓ Jay Forsyth

Larry Danton

Bill Hillar

~~Diety~~
Don Dietrich

David Kaufman

Deloris Johns

Bonalyne Bricker Smith

Roger Garrett

George Grossman

Dieter Romboy

~~Robert Yee~~

~~Diety~~

Max Zwanziger

(No alternate)

Blaine Wilson

Richard Doi

Karl Zink

Louis Kollmeyer

Richard Gray

E. Dee Torrey

Phil Tolin

Chester Keller

Keith Rinehart

James Brennan

Thomas Thelen

~~Diety~~
✓ Neil Roberts

VISITORS

PLEASE SIGN THIS SHEET

Faculty Senate Meeting

James Brennan
Hann Howard

Jim Alexander

Joe E. Backlund

How Bojos

Rae Hembeck

Ken Rieckhoff

Olle E. Skov

Harriet B. Ramsdell

Kristen Greep

3

RANDOM
ROLL CALL VOTE

note c
PE

SENATOR	AYE	NAY	ABSTAIN	ALTERNATE
McQuarrie, Duncan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Max Zwanziger
Gulezian, Allen	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Jay Forsyth <i>Jay Danton</i>
Adams, Kathleen	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Clayton Denman
Corwin King	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			Roger Garrett
Wiberg, Curt		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Thomas Thelen
Dugmore, Owen		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Robert Nuzum
Osborn, Dolores		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Blaine Wilson
Sahlstrand, Margaret				Louis Kollmeyer
Kollmeyer, Louis		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Margaret Sahlstrand
Fadenrecht, George		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		William Schmidt
Dickson, Rosella		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<i>Donna M. Ward</i>
Dunnington, Hazel		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Jim Goodrich
Jensen, Richard				Bonaly B. Smith
Douce, Pearl				Woodrow Monte
Vogel, Ruth		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Chester Keller
Brooks, James		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		--
Mahajani, Usha		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Ed Harrington
Vifian, John			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Robert Yee
Lester, Nancy		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Keith Rinehart
Envick, Robert		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Dieter Romboy
Bachrach, Jay				Ron Hales
Gregor, John		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Chester Keller
Mitchell, Robert		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Bill Hillar
Young, Madge		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		--
Andress, Joel		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Karl Zimb
Warren, Gordon	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Joe Schomer <i>Neil Roberts</i>
Allen, Craig				Cal Willberg
Burt, David		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		James Brennan
Street, Warren	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			--
Habib, Helmi				Richard Johnson
Hawkins, Charles		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Richard Johnson
Porter, Larry			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Phil Tolin
Kingman, Kathy				Don Dietrich
Smith, Milo		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		David Kaufman
Leeman, Betty		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Richard Doi
Franz, Wolfgang				--
Samuelson, Dale		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		E. Dee Torrey
Keith, Art		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Charles Brunner
	3	23	4	<i>Jay Forsyth</i>

CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE

ELLENSBURG, WASHINGTON

Department of Sociology

(509) 963-1305

May 5, 1977

98926

RECEIVED
MAY 9 1977
FACULTY SENATE

Helmi Habib, President
Faculty Senate
Campus

Dear Professor Habib:

I request that you withdraw from your agenda Soc. 234, Mexican Villages, which was recently approved by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. The reason I make this request is that I learned this week that the CWSC Program in Mexico is being cancelled. Professor Hawkins planned the Mexican Villages course directly in connection with his teaching activities in the Mexico program. Therefore, there is no longer a reason to add the course to the CWSC catalogue.

Sincerely,

R. W. Hansen
Russell W. Hansen
Chairman

RWH:bb

cc: Charles Hawkins



central washington state college • art department • ellensburg, washington 98926 • 963-2665 • an equal opportunity employer

TO: Dr. Schliesman, Dean of Undergraduate Studies
Dr. Habib, Chairman of Faculty Senate

FROM: Quentin Fitzgerald, Chairman, the Graduate Council

DATE: May 4, 1977

RE: PROPOSED CHANGES IN CAMPUS COMMITTEES (SECOND DRAFT, UNDATED)

Dean Jones has informed me by memorandum that comments concerned the referenced proposal are being solicited. Herein, are my comments.

I do not think the Graduate Council should be re-organized from its present membership to a ten member Council. My principle objection is that a 10 member Council will abolish the very sound principle upon which the Council is presently peopled: Every concerned department has the right, and privilege, to directly contribute to the graduate program.

Some additional comments concerning the reduction in size of this council:

The present size of the Council does not preclude its efficient operation.

The presently constituted council does not, in my judgement, present a great burden upon the time of its members.

Furthermore, I wish to set forth my vigorous objection to a consolidated Curriculum Committee of twelve members. It should be noted that my objections are based on my experience with the curriculum affairs of the college, including the Chairmanship of my department's Curriculum Committee for five years, and membership and Chairmanship of the Curriculum Committee of the Graduate Council for four years.

Curriculum work is specialized work: The concerns of a Graduate Curriculum Committee are different from those of an Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. For example, an Undergraduate Committee is concerned with breadth and depth considerations, which presupposes that its members will be familiar with a particular educational stance of the college, policy statements, trends in undergraduate education, the needs of a young student population and the history of previous decisions. Armed with this kind of specialized knowledge, members of an Undergraduate Curriculum Committee can, hopefully, attend to proposals in a fair and knowledgeable way.

May 4, 1977

Conversely, members of a graduate level committee should be knowledgeable about an entirely different array of policies, facts, viewpoints, literature and the like.

Furthermore, the total amount of work will not be reduced, since the amount of work is based upon the actions of the initiator of curriculum changes, e.g., the number of new course proposals submitted in any given year is not a function of the committee but, rather, of the initiator of a new course. Regardless of how the Curriculum Committees are formulated, a new course proposal will still require the Department Chairman's approval, a Dean's approval, some committee's approval, and the approval of the Faculty Senate.

Admittedly, the Graduate Curriculum Committee is a busy one. They probably average two hours of work each week for the entire school year. But no committee re-organization will reduce these hours. My experience with large committees (as opposed to large councils) is that the larger the membership, the harder it is to get anything done. It seems likely that a 12 member Curriculum Committee-as far as Graduate Curriculum level work is concerned-will not improve efficiency but will, rather, make the curriculum processes even slower. If it is the intent to further break down the 12 member committee so that, say, four members deal with Graduate Curriculum proposals, then you have accomplished nothing except a cosmetic change. The present organization of the Graduate Council allows a more careful scrutiny of proposals and appeals than a merger would allow. I believe that graduate matters would be seen as less vital-and therefore slighted-if handled by a committee responsible as well for undergraduate matters.

Lastly, it should be obvious, from my memorandum, that I do not think that the Graduate Council should be deprived of its right to select its own Admissions, Matriculation and Graduate Committee, or its own Program Review and Evaluation Committee. Nor do I think that any change should be made that excludes Graduate Student participation. The re-organization proposal does exclude them.

Finally, I think your efforts to improve the configuration of Campus Committees is highly commendable. But I do not think that your specific recommendations concerning our graduate program should be implemented. I urge you to reconsider.

kjs

CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE

DEPARTMENT OF GEOGRAPHY

ELLENSBURG, WASHINGTON

98926

May 11, 1977

Dr. Helmi Habib
Chairman
CWSC Faculty Senate
CAMPUS

Dear Helmi:

While the General Education Committee's proposal to once again modify the General Education requirements represents a great deal of thought and effort on the part of the committee members, it will not solve the fundamental problem of general education. Intellectual breadth is not facilitated by forcing students to take a smattering of courses that usually would be intended to lure new majors to the various disciplines. Breadth means breadth and we should either require our students to take at least one course in every academic discipline on campus or else develop a special set of cross-disciplinary courses that will introduce the student to the real range of intellectual opinion, theory, and practice extant in the world. General Education courses may well be the last bastion of liberal education in a curriculum that must per force seek to train students instead of educating them.

We therefore urge that the Senate reject the proposed changes so that a more satisfactory solution can be reached. We suggest rejection on the following grounds.

1. It unfairly discriminates against those departments that, because of the synthesizing nature of their disciplines, must cross the arbitrary boundaries between Social Sciences, Natural Sciences, and the Humanities. General Education's arena should be the real world of interrelated interdependent phenomena and not that of disciplinary boundaries, petty interdepartmental rivalry, academic myopia resulting from having to share smaller pies.
2. The limited number of courses required to "satisfy" the breadth requirements cannot possibly allow the student to sample the real breadth of intellectual opinion in any one School. The purpose of breadth requirements should be to expose the student to broad, synthesized knowledge that will help him to integrate his unique experiences with the complex generalities of the social, physical, and esthetic structures of the world.

3. The specification of one to ten breadth courses per department discriminates against the smaller departments that do not have the faculty resources to staff the maximum number of special courses that would be required by the proposal, hence would lose out in the race for credit hours.

We should like to suggest that serious consideration be given to the creation of three highly integrative courses to be required of every entering freshman student. Each would be a year long sequence that would explore the total fields of knowledge of the Humanities, the Social and Behavioral Sciences, the Natural Sciences and Mathematics, and Professional Studies in some framework that is not bound by the narrow constraints of institutional structure. Each academic department on campus would be requested to supply one faculty member every year to help present an integrated picture of whatever great divisions of reality are chosen and incidentally represent the point of view of that discipline. Student credit hours generated in these courses would be pooled and apportioned equally to all departments, or better yet, used solely to support the overall staffing of the institution with the proviso that no single department's staff could be in any way jeopardized by participation of its members in the program. Some departments, because of the diversity of their "naively-given segments of reality" might need to participate in two, or even in all three, of the integrative courses.

Furthermore, since there would almost certainly have to be some smaller-group (discussion or quiz section) contact between individual instructors and students, would this not be an excellent vehicle for our nascent Honors College? Special Honors sections could be established to explore particular issues in depth or to bring in other instructors who might not be regular participants in the super courses, but who could extend the students' knowledge in particular areas. We feel this would be salutary and stimulating for the students and the faculty.

The time is upon us when we can ill-afford to pull further apart, as the proposal currently before you would lead us to do, and must work together for the benefit of ourselves, our students, and the institution.

Sincerely,



John Q. Ressler
Chairman

JQR:ljl

MEMORANDUM

TO: All Senators

FROM: H. S. Habib, Senate Chairman

DATE: May 11, 1977

RE: Mechanism for nomination of officers for the 1977-78 Academic Year

An up-dated roster of all Senators who will be serving during the 1977-78 academic year is attached to this memorandum. The positions on the Senate Executive Committee that need to be filled are as follows: Chairman, Vice-Chairman, Secretary, and two at-large positions. Please consult the Faculty Code, Sections 1.60 and 1.65 relative to eligibility for election and to the powers and duties of the officers.

The mechanism developed by the Executive Committee for nomination of officers is as follows:

- 1) Each Senator who wishes to make a nomination for any or all positions on the Executive Committee must approach the prospective nominee and obtain his or her unqualified approval to have his or her name placed on the ballot.
- 2) After obtaining approval by the nominee or nominees, the Senator must then submit the nominations in writing to the Faculty Senate Office no later than May 17, 1977.
- 3) A complete list of nominators and nominees will be prepared and distributed to all Senators prior to the May 25 Senate meeting.
- 4) During the May 25 Senate meeting, the floor will be open for further nominations, with the clear understanding that nominators do indeed have the approval of the nominees to place their names on the ballot.

NOMINATIONS FOR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

1977-1978

CHAIRMAN _____

VICE-CHAIRMAN _____

SECRETARY _____

AT-LARGE OFFICER _____

AT-LARGE OFFICER _____

Please return your nominations to the Faculty Senate Office by May 17, 1977

Department	1977-78 Term Yrs. to Serve	Senator
Aerospace Studies	2	Dale Samuelson
Anthropology	1	Kathleen Adams
Art	2	Margaret Sahlstrand
Biological Sciences	1	Curt Wiberg
Business & Economics	3	
	1	*Wolfgang Franz
Business Ed & Administrative Management	3	V. Wayne Klemm
Chemistry	2	Helmi Habib
Communications	2	Corwin King
Counseling & Testing	2	Owen Dugmore
Drama	2	Milo Smith
Education	1	*Frank Carlson
	3	Art Keith
	1	*Madge Young
English	3	John Vifian
Ethnic Studies	1	Larry Porter
Foreign Languages	3	Rosco Tolman
Geography	3	Joel Andress
Geology & Physics	2	Robert Mitchell
History	1	Gordon Warren
Home Economics	1	Pearl Duce
Library	2	George Fadenrecht
Mathematics	—	
Music (and English)	3	
	1	*Russell Ross
Philosophy	2	John Utzinger
Physical Education	3	Erlice Killorn
	1	*Betty Hileman
Political Science	3	Robert Yee
Psychology	2	Duncan McQuarrie
	1	Warren Street
Sociology	3	William Benson
Technology & Industrial Education	2	Robert Envick
Washington Center for ECE	1	Rosella Dickson
President		James Brooks
Associated Students		Chris Graap
		Chuck McClure
		Ken Winslow

*At-large positions

The Budget Committee agrees with the recommendation of the importance of placing the Central Washington State College on the CFE salary scale. It was adopted and approved by the Senate last year. The Committee has modified it slightly by factoring a 4% increase into the base salary in line with the proposed budget for this year. Any changes in the amount of funds appropriated by the legislature will naturally need a recalculation of this scale for the first year.

Assuming that an across-the-board 5% raise amounts to a maximum of \$295,000, the Budget Committee proposes that the money be allocated in the following fashion:

(1) 4% (or 80% of the 5%) should be set aside for salary increments and the other 1% (or 20% of the 5%) should be allocated for merit and promotion.

(2) every faculty member should be put on the scale at the salary closest to but above his or her present salary. Thus, a person now at step 10.5 drawing a salary on the old salary scale of \$15,975 would be placed at step 4 on the proposed scale for a salary of \$16,210. The cost would be \$41,186. Faculty would automatically advance 1 step annually. At the present scale, this movement would cost \$210,302.

(3) after the faculty change to the new scale everyone should receive a raise of one-half step. The cost would be \$87,471.

(4) adjustments as noted below. The cost would be \$91,480.¹

(5) the sum of \$50,000, or 17% of the total allocation, should be reserved for merit and promotion.

¹ Since the amount of increase in individual salaries will vary widely with the change to a new scale, lump sum salary adjustments should be made in the first year for practically everyone. The largest salary increase resulting from the change over would be for those faculty now at step 21. Their

Senate Budget Committee Recommendations, p. 2.

salary at the new step of 14 would rise \$376. However, faculty now at step 11.5 on the old scale will see their salaries rise only \$1 as they change. Although there is bound to be some salary inequity at any time the faculty change to a new scale, the committee, wishing to ease the transition and avoid unnecessary irritation, proposes that all those faculty not having their salaries rise by \$376 be given adjustments for one year as partial compensation. Thus, someone at step 10.5 on the old scale would receive a once-only salary adjustment of \$141 spread over the ten months. Such adjustment would not occur the following years even though faculty at the step 21 to 14 transition would continue to receive the original \$376 increase. It is not a completely equitable arrangement, but the alternative would be to have similar salary adjustments each year in order to avoid invidious comparisons involving a relatively small sum.

Changing to the new scale and raising each faculty member's salary by one-half, plus adding the above adjustments (which total \$66,480), would leave roughly \$75,000. The committee feels that a more appropriate figure for merit and promotion would be \$50,000, and recommends that the remaining \$25,000 be distributed among all faculty for a lump sum once-only payment of \$86 each. Thus, the total adjustment figure would come to \$91,480.

Full Professor

Associate Professor

Assistant Professor

Step	Annual Salary	Annual Salary	Annual Salary	Annual Salary
1	78.0	10,640		
2	81.0	10,950		
3	84.0	11,260		
4	85.6	11,570		
5	88.0	11,880		
6	90.4	12,222	549	3.48
7	92.8	12,546	648	3.45
8	95.2	12,871	649	3.44
9	97.6	13,175	649	3.43
10	100.0	13,520	649	3.42
11	102.4	13,844	649	3.42
12	104.8	14,169	649	3.40
13	107.3	14,506	662	3.39
14	109.8	14,845	676	3.37
15	112.3	15,183	677	3.36
16	114.8	15,521	676	3.35
17	117.3	15,860	676	3.34
18	119.9	16,210	689	3.34
19	122.5	16,562	703	3.33
20	125.1	16,914	706	3.32
21	127.7	17,265	703	3.31
22	130.3	17,617	703	3.30
23	132.9	17,968	703	3.29
24	135.6	18,333	716	3.28
25	138.3	18,698	730	3.27
26	141.0	19,063	730	3.26
27	143.7	19,428	730	3.25
28	146.5	19,807	744	3.24
29	149.3	20,185	757	3.23
30	152.1	20,564	757	3.22
31	154.9	20,942	757	3.21
32	157.6	21,335	771	3.20
33	160.7	21,727	785	3.19
34	163.6	22,119	784	3.18
35	166.5	22,511	784	3.17
36	169.5	22,916	797	3.16
37	172.5	23,322	811	3.15
38	175.5	23,728	812	3.14
39	178.5	24,133	811	3.13
40	181.6	24,552	824	3.12
41	184.7	24,971	838	3.11
42	187.8	25,391	839	3.10
43	191.0	25,823	852	3.09
44	194.2	26,256	865	3.08
45	197.4	26,688	865	3.07
46	200.7	27,135	879	3.06
47	204.0	27,581	893	3.05
48	207.3	28,027	892	3.04
49	210.7	28,482	906	3.03
50	214.1	28,946	919	3.02
51	217.5	29,406	919	3.01
52	221.0	29,379	933	3.00
53	224.5	30,352	946	2.99
54	228.0	30,326	947	2.98
55	231.6	31,312	960	2.97
56	235.2	31,799	973	2.96
57	238.8	32,286	974	2.95
58	242.5	32,786	987	2.94
59	246.2	33,285	1000	2.93
60	250.0	33,800	1014	2.92

FACULTY SENATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

REPORT TO THE SENATE, MAY 11, 1977

1. The Curriculum Committee has completed its updating of the curriculum Guide. Revisions have been made on sixteen pages of the guide and have been submitted to the Executive Committee of the Senate. The changes consisted of (a) correcting omissions (b) implementing Senate actions, (c) reflecting changes in college administrative procedures, and (d) providing clarity and internal consistency.

2. The Curriculum Committee is in receipt of letters from Profs. Teets, Habib, and Richards, all relating to proposals submitted to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee to change 21 History courses to variable credit format. The Senate considered the question of variable credit courses at some length in the fall of 1976. A chronology of those events is attached to this report. All of the possible uses of the variable credit policy alluded to in Prof. Teets's letter were discussed then. The vote of the Senate reflected the sentiment that the versatility of the variable credit format was more important than any abuses that may result, since the probability of abuses was judged to be low. As Prof. Richards's letter points out, the vote was quite clear on this point and there is no policy reason why the variable credit proposal of the History department should not be approved.

3. The Executive Committee of the Graduate Council has asked for comment on the appropriateness of assigning a graduate course number to the proposed addition to the Mathematics curriculum titled Fun With Numbers. The course is designed to teach ~~about~~ school teachers about some of the intriguing properties of mathematical processes, mathematical games, etc. While the curriculum guide has no guidelines regarding graduate level courses, it is clear from the guide that the assignment of a course to its appropriate level is determined by the nature of the course content, not the class standing of students most likely to take the course. Since the mathematical complexity of this course is admittedly low, an undergraduate number would seem most appropriate.

Variable credit chronology

April 26, 1976: Letter from UCC to FSCC recommends policy that would restrict variable credits to workshop, seminar, individual study, special topics, practicum, and field work. Courses with other titles denoting specific content must be offered for fixed credits.

June 2, 1976: FSCC issues report to Senate, concurring with UCC recommendation. This section of FSCC report is numbered 7(a).

June 2, 1976: Senate moves to adopt FSCC report (Motion 1508), but the motion is postponed until the first meeting of fall quarter (Motion 1509)

October 6, 1976: Senate takes up the FSCC report, but votes to delay consideration until Oct. 20 because of absence of Otto Jakubek, former FSCC chairman (Motion 1523)

October 20, 1976: Section 7(a) is separated from two other parts of the FSCC report (Motion 1528). Section 7(a) was then approved by a majority voice vote (Motion 1532).

November 3, 1976: Senate receives letter from Dean Williams asking that variable credit be allowed to regular catalog courses.

November 17, 1976: Senate receives letter from Vice-President Harrington asking Senate to reconsider Section 7(a). Senate also received a petition, signed by more than 10% of the faculty, asking that Section 7(a) be reconsidered. By the rules of the Senate, Motion 1532 was brought back on the floor for reconsideration. Motion 1532 failed by a majority voice vote.

See
Copy

CAMPUS COMMITTEE STRUCTURE

Suggested Change:

- E. 1. Graduate Council with 10 members chosen from departments or areas that *are directly involved with* graduate programs. Programs or areas that graduate 15 or more per year must be represented by one member on the Council.
- E. 2. Undergraduate Council with 15 members, two from each school and five at-large.

Addition to Protocols:

- 4. The mechanism for the operation of the College Curriculum Committee, the AMG Committee, and the P. R. and E Committee (F 1, 2, 3) will be as follows:
 - a. Each Committee will elect a chairman. All material addressed to the Committee will be referred to the chairman.
 - b. The Committee chairman will distribute the material to the proper sub-group within his committee for consideration. For example, the Curriculum Committee chairman will give Teacher Education curriculum proposals to the four members of his committee that are also members of the Teacher Education Council.
 - c. The proper sub-groups will consider the material, consult with their parent Councils if appropriate, and recommend action to the committee as a whole. If the sub-group's recommendation is not affirmative, the committee as a whole may not over-ride the decision of the sub-group. If the sub-group's recommendation is affirmative, the committee as a whole may over-ride the decision of the sub-group. For example: if the four members of the Curriculum Committee, whose parent Council is the Graduate Council, decide that a particular graduate proposal is not acceptable, that proposal is returned to the originating department or program. If, however, these four members do recommend approval of a particular graduate proposal, the Curriculum Committee as a whole may disagree and return the proposal to the originating department or program; or the Curriculum Committee as a whole may agree and thus send the proposal to the Senate.

See
Copy

Proposed Changes in Campus Committees

Submitted by the Senate Executive Committee and
Dean Donald SchliesmanNote: Numbers in parentheses indicate current committee membership.A. Eliminate:

1. Computer Services Committee (6)
2. Athletics Committee (5)
3. ASC Board of Control Advisory Committee (2)
4. Social Science Committee (9)

B. Reduce Membership:

1. Long Range Planning Committee (6)

Faculty - 3	Students - 1
Assoc. of Administrators - 1	Senate Chairman - ex officio
Employee Council - 1	Director of Institutional Research - ex officio

2. Faculty Research Committee (7)

Faculty - 5 (one from each school)
Coordinator of Academic Grants & Contracts - ex officio

3. Professional Leave Committee (6)

Faculty - 6 (one from each school and the library)

4. Retirement and Insurance Committee (7)

Faculty - 3
Association of Adm. - 1
Employee Council - 2
Business Manager - ex officio

5. Library Advisory Council (9)

Faculty - 5 (one from each school)
Dean of Library Services - ex officio

C. Combine:

1. Campus Space Committee and Campus Site and Development Committee (13)

Faculty - 4
Employee Council - 1
Space Analyst - ex officio
Director Fac. Planning & Constr. - ex officio
Association of Administrators - 1

D. Change Name:

1. Professional Leave Committee to Professional and Scholarship Leave Committee.

E. Re-Organize All Councils (36):

1. Graduate Council with 10 members chosen from departments or areas that have graduate programs.
2. Undergraduate Council with 15 members, 3 from each School.
3. Teacher Education Council with 10 members chosen such that a majority of the members are directly involved in teacher education.

F. From the membership of the three Councils, establish:

1. College Curriculum Committee consisting of 12 faculty, four from each Council.
2. College Admissions, Matriculation, and Graduation Committee consisting of 6 faculty, two from each Council.
3. College Program Review and Evaluation Committee consisting of 9 faculty, three from each Council.
4. General Education Committee consisting of 5 faculty all from the Undergraduate Council and selected so that it would consist of one member from each School.

Protocols relating to E and F:

1. The Dean of Graduate School and Research, Dean of Undergraduate Studies, and Director of Teacher Education would be ex officio members of their respective Councils.
2. All members of the Councils are not to be assigned any other committee duties, whether standing or ad hoc.
3. Each Council will have a Chairman who will not be a member of any of the sub-committees of the Council and who will coordinate all activities relating to the affairs of his or her Council.

Committees that Remain Unchanged:

Star Steering Committee
Joint Student Fees
Student Publications
Campus Safety
Bookstore
Interdepartmental Major
Academic Standing

College Union Board
Campus Judicial
Traffic
Student Financial Assistance
Board of Academic Appeals
Faculty Grievance

PART IV

The following proposals were jointly agreed to by the Senate Executive Committee, the Senate Code Committee, President Brooks and Assistant Attorney General Owen F. Clarke, Jr. Changes to the Faculty Code of Personnel Policies and Procedures are recommended as follows:

I. Section 2.16 be removed and replaced by:

2.16 Distinguished Professor of the College

- A. The Board of Trustees may designate as "Distinguished Professor of the College," with the appropriate one of the following appellations: 1) Teaching, 2) Research, or 3) Public Service, an individual who holds the academic rank of Professor or Associate Professor and has achieved tenure at Central Washington State College. The faculty member designated Distinguished Professor of the College during or after a period of outstanding achievement may choose to relinquish full-time teaching and/or administrative duties and assume reduced duties.
- B. The award of a Distinguished Professorship will be for a specified period of time, not less than one academic year, and may be renewed by the Board of Trustees. During the period of the Distinguished Professorship, the faculty member will be assigned and report to the President, Vice-president for Academic Affairs, Vice-president for Business Affairs, or appropriate dean or other unit director as designated by the board. The recipient of a Distinguished Professorship will retain all of the rights and privileges of this Code he held prior to his appointment to this professorship. The faculty member may choose to decline or at any time resign a Distinguished Professorship without penalty.
- C. The Board of Trustees will annually establish the salary of each Distinguished Professorship in accordance with his assigned duties. The first academic year (or three quarters including summer) of the award will carry a uniform salary increase of at least \$1,000, if the faculty member continues full time service and a pro-rated amount for reduced services.
- D. These Professorships are based on the recommendations of the appropriate dean or unit director, and the Vice-president for Academic Affairs. The Vice-president shall refer these recommendations to the screening committee composed of one member from each school and appointed by the Executive Committee of the Senate. This committee will recommend to the Vice-president, who shall then recommend to the president.

Selection will be based on the following standards:

- (1) Distinguished Professor of the College (Teaching):
 - a) demonstrated mastery of teaching techniques,
 - b) continuing scholarship in the field,

of hearing the charges do not allege adequate cause for dismissal, shall be given to the members of the Board of Trustees for their consideration in acting on the president's recommendation.

- F. The principal hearing officer shall determine whether the hearing shall be open to the educational community or whether particular persons should be permitted to attend or excluded from attendance.
- G. The faculty member will be permitted to have an advisor or legal counsel of his own choice present at the hearing at his own expense.
- H. The burden of proof that adequate cause for dismissal or grounds for termination due to reduction-in-force exists rests with the college, and shall be satisfied only by clear and convincing evidence in the record considered as a whole.
- I. The principal hearing officer may grant recesses of the proceedings to enable either party to investigate evidence as to which a valid claim of surprise is made.
- J. If the parties agree that a formal record or transcript of the proceedings shall be furnished, the cost shall be borne equally by the parties, otherwise the costs shall be borne by the party requesting the transcript.
- K. In cases of dismissal for cause, all documents, communications, and records dealing with the processing of an appeal or grievance shall be filed separately from the individual's personnel file in a sealed envelope which shall not be opened except for use as legal evidence, and then only upon prior written notice to the person. A summary of the final resolution of the case and reference to the entire grievance or appeal file shall be placed in the individual's personnel file.
- L. The faculty member will be afforded an opportunity to obtain necessary witnesses and documentary or other evidence, and the administration of the college will, insofar as it is possible for it to do so, secure the cooperation of such witnesses and make available necessary documents and other evidence within its control, subject to restrictions on the basis of confidentiality or privilege.
- M. The parties will have the right to confront and cross-examine all witnesses. Where the witness cannot or will not appear, but the principal hearing officer determines that the interests of justice require admission of his statement or testimony, the principal hearing officer may provide for written interrogatories or depositions and may issue subpoenas as provided in RCW 28B.19.120. Such interrogatories and the responses thereto, and depositions so authorized, shall be admissible in the record of the proceedings, provided, that no person shall be compelled to divulge information which he could not be compelled to divulge by answers to interrogatories or by deposition in a court of law.
- N. The principal hearing officer may admit any evidence which is of probative value in determining the issues involved. Every possible effort will be made to obtain the most reliable evidence available.

6. The existence or non-existence of a material fact or facts or agreed in a stipulation or an admission of record, will be conclusively presumed against any party bound thereby, and no other evidence with respect thereto will be received on behalf of such party, provided:
- (1) Upon Waiver Binding. Such a stipulation or admission is binding upon the parties by whom it is made, their privies and upon all other parties to the proceeding who do not expressly and unequivocally deny the existence or non-existence of the material fact so admitted or stipulated, upon the making thereof, if made on the record at a pre-hearing conference, oral hearing, oral argument or by a writing filed and served upon all parties within five (5) days after a copy of such stipulation or admission has been served upon them;
 - (2) Withdrawal. Any party bound by a stipulation or admission or record at any time prior to final decision may be permitted to withdraw the same in whole or in part by showing to the satisfaction of the principal hearing officer that such stipulation or admission was made inadvertently or under a bona fide mistake of fact contrary to the true fact and that its withdrawal at the time proposed will not unjustly prejudice the rights of other parties to the proceeding.
7. A proposal for decision and findings of fact and conclusions of law shall be forthwith served upon the parties and transmitted to the Board of Trustees together with a record of the proceeding. The hearing record shall include: (a) all documents, motions, and intermediate rulings; (b) evidence received or considered; (c) a statement of matters officially noticed; (d) questions and offers of proof, objections and rulings thereon; (e) proposed findings and exceptions, and (f) any decision, opinion, or report by the officer or committee chairman presiding at the hearing. Findings of fact and conclusions of law shall be based only on the hearing record.
8. Within thirty (30) days of service of the proposal for decision and findings of fact and conclusions of law, any party adversely affected may file exceptions, and thereafter all parties may present written argument to the Board of Trustees, which shall consider the whole record or such portions as may be cited by the parties, and after such review the board shall announce its decision and final action to be taken and the reasons therefor at regular board meeting.
9. Every decision and order, whether proposed, initial, or final, shall:
- (1) Be correctly captioned as to name of agency and name of proceeding;
 - (2) Designate all parties and counsel to the proceeding;
 - (3) Include a concise statement of the nature and background of the proceeding;
 - (4) Be accompanied by appropriate numbered findings of fact and conclusions of law;

4/28/77
Page 4/10

- (5) Whenever practical, the conclusions of law shall include the reason or reasons for the particular order or remedy afforded;
- (6) Whenever practical, the conclusions and/or order shall be referenced to specific provisions of the law and/or regulations appropriate thereto, together with reasons and precedents relied upon to support the same.

III. Section 3.59 A 12 be removed as written and replaced by:

3.59 A 12 If the faculty member disagrees with the final decision in the informal hearing procedure, he may then request a formal hearing by directing a written request for a hearing to the chairman of the Board of Trustees within ten (10) days after written notice of the decision, in the informal review procedure has been given by the President or his designee. The formal hearing shall be concluded in accordance with the procedures set forth in Section 3.93 C through R of this Code, with the exception of Sections 3.93 H and K which are applicable to grievances under this section.

F. Recommend that Section 3.59 have added to the heading after Hearings: In Cases Not Covered by Section 3.92.

G. Recommend that the Senate instruct the Code Committee to review the entire Code as proposed for the purpose of determining if the cross references are properly numbered. Further, that the Senate authorizes the Code Committee to incorporate appropriate changes in the numbers as part of the Senate recommendations relative to the President's proposed amendments to the Faculty Code.